

EXHIBIT 63

From: Matthew Barnett
Sent: Tuesday, March 27, 2007 9:10 AM
To: Suh, Maurice; pbrunet@brunetavocats.com; Carmen Frobos; Chris Campbell; Howard Jacobs; Janette Henry; Richard McLaren; Richard R. Young; Richard Young's assistant; Rosalie Brunel; Travis Tygart
Subject: RE: AGREEMENT IN RE: GC-IRMS EXPERT



image001.jpg (1 KB)

Dear Panel Members:

With respect to the expert issue, this correspondence confirms that we have mutually agreed to Dr. Aguilera. We also agree that the proper computer/technical expert to assist Dr. Aguilera remains an open issue. It is USADA's position that someone either from MicroMass/GV Instruments or recommended by them, would be the most appropriate second expert. While the forensic computer consultant suggested by Mr. Suh may be able to extract the data, we do not believe that company would be in a position to comment on the viability of even attempting to run the old data on new software, let alone the potential problems that might be caused by such an attempt. Accordingly, we would respectfully submit that it would be proper for the Panel to contact MicroMass/GV to determine if there is someone with the proper technical knowledge who could serve the Panel, or at a minimum, provide input on whether such a suggested procedure is even feasible.

Regarding the further analysis of the remaining samples, this correspondence confirms that USADA is not requesting a further hearing with the Panel as suggested by Mr. Suh. USADA believes the Panel's order on this issue provided sufficient clarity for the gathering of evidence to continue. USADA does not understand that it is in a position where it requires Mr. Landis to agree with the details of how this evidence is gathered. While, USADA is attempting to accommodate the suggestions of counsel for Mr. Landis, we believe an additional hearing before the Panel on this issue would be an unnecessary expenditure of resources and would cause further delay.

The status of the further analysis is as follows: At the Request of Respondent, USADA inquired with Dr. Catlin as to whether the UCLA Laboratory would be able to run the samples in advance of the hearing. Dr. Catlin's response was that it was very, very unlikely that UCLA would be in a position to do so. Respondent's counsel has asked us to obtain confirmation in writing from Dr. Catlin and we will provide that confirmation at our earliest opportunity.

Accordingly, USADA is proceeding with the plan to have LNDD perform the further analysis. In an effort to further accommodate Respondent, we have, in principle, agreed to a request by Mr. Jacobs that the analysis include the testing of two known negative samples and that the Panel's expert be allowed to recode all of the samples to achieve blinding. We are in the process of further discussions regarding the logistics of this proposal.

One clarification on dates for analysis is required. Contrary to our previous letter to the Panel the laboratory is not able to perform the additional analysis on April 9. However LNDD can perform the analysis on either April 2, or April 16, whichever works better for the Panel's expert.

With respect to the Panel's additional Order on the remaining discovery categories, the parties have conferred and would propose that the deadline for comments be extended until the end of this week. At that point, USADA will be in a position to provide final details regarding what will be produced and barring unforeseen events, will be able to produce the remaining documents concurrently with its response. The parties believe that this approach will aid in bringing finality to the remaining discovery issues.

Also, the parties believe we have achieved resolution of the privilege log issue. We will inform the Panel if that is not the case.

Regards,

Matthew Barnett

-----Original Message-----